

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representatives Messrs. Larry Cullen, Jeffrey Eschbach, Gregory Cox, and Walter Johnson during a telephone interview on October 13, 2005.

Applicant presented a proposed amendment to the Examiner prior to the interview.

During the interview, Applicant explained the present invention, Mobile IP, and the Wada reference. Applicant explained that both Mobile IP and Wada use the same device during a session, i.e. they do not transfer a session to another device. Applicant further explained that devices in the network chain do not participate in the session but merely pass the communication. The Examiner appreciated the distinctions raised by Applicants and generally agreed with them, but the Examiner suggested to further clarify the limitations relating to a device/node and a session. The above amendments are believed to be within the spirit of the Examiner's helpful suggestion.

I. Introduction

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above application.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 19 and 20 are independent claims.

II. Amendment

Claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 19 and 20 have been amended to more particularly claim that which Applicant regards as the inventions therein.

No new matter has been added.

III. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Perkins (Mobile IP).

In accordance with the discussions in the interview, the above claims are believed to be patentable over Wada alone or in combination with Perkins. As discussed, Wada discloses to transfer a session between networks on the same device – to allow the device to move during a session. Wada does not disclose to transfer a communication session from one device or node to another device or node, wherein the device or node is configured to allow a user to receive or send the communication session. Perkins also relates to a Mobile IP system and does not cure the deficiencies of Wada.

As Wada, taken alone or in combination with Perkins, does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of any of amended independent claims 1, 10, 14, 17, 19, and 20, neither Wada nor Wada combined with Perkins render any of these independent claims unpatentable. Likewise, claims 2-9, which depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the limitations thereof, claims 11-13, which depend on claim 10 and incorporate all the limitations thereof, claims 15-16 which depend on claim 14 and incorporate all the limitations thereof, and claim 18 which depends on claim 17 and incorporate all the limitations thereof, are similarly patentable.

IV. Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Date: October 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By: LTC
Lawrence T. Cullen
Reg. No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1797